NK



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| 2/ (5/85/ UNITE  | ED STATES PATENT A | ND TRADEMARK OFFICE  |  |  |
|--|--------------------|----------------------|--|--|
| Tanana m   |                    |                      | UNITED STATES DEPARTY<br>United States Patent and T.<br>Address: COMMISSIONER OF P.<br>Washington, D.C. 20231<br>www.uspto.gov | rademark Office<br>ATENTS AND TRADEMARKS |
| APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.  | CONFIRMATION NO.                         |
| 09/707,445   | 11/06/2000         | Gilbert M. Aust      | A31-2047RE   | 9717                                     |
| 75   | 90 01/29/2003      |                      |  |  |
| Tarolli Sundheim Covell Tummino & Szabo LLP<br>1111 Leader Building<br>526 Superior Avenue |                    |                      | EXAMINER   |  |
|  |                    |                      | THALER, MICHAEL H  |  |
| Cleveland, OH  | 44114-1400         |                      | ARTUNIT  | PAPER NUMBER                             |

3731 DATE MAILED: 01/29/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Application No.

09/707,445

Applicant(s)

Aust et al.

## **Advisory Action**

Examiner
Michael Thaler

Art Unit

3731

|   | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence  | address  |
|---|--|--|
| Theref<br>rejecti<br>allowa             | EPLY FILED <u>Jan 13, 2003</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL fore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A on under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the appance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Contin compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | proper reply to a final lication in condition for  |
| (************************************** | THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]   |  |
| a)                                      | The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  |  |
| b)                                      | The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the m final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF See MPEP 706.07(f).   | nailing date of the  |
| ext<br>app<br>set                       | tensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136 tension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding or opriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statut in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later the illing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CF   | g amount of the fee. The<br>ory period for reply originally<br>an three months after the |
| 1. 🗆                                    | A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appearance of the appe         | ne period set forth in<br>II.  |
| 2. 🗆                                    | The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:   |  |
| (a)                                     | $\square$ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE bel   | ow);   |
| (b)                                     | they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);   |  |
| (c)                                     | they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducin issues for appeal; and/or   | g or simplifying the   |
| (d)                                     | $\ \square$ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected  | claims.  |
|   | NOTE:  |  |
|   | •  |  |
| 3. 🗆                                    | Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |  |
|   |  |  |
| 4. 🗆                                    | Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allo a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | wable if submitted in  |
| 5. 🛭                                    | The a) $\square$ affidavit, b) $\square$ exhibit, or c) $\boxtimes$ request for reconsideration has been considered by application in condition for allowance because:  Please see attached page.  | ut does NOT place the  |
| 6. 🗆                                    | The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues when the Examiner in the final rejection.  | nich were newly raised   |
| 7. 🗆                                    | For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be e | ntered and an<br>ded.  |
|   | The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  |
|   | Claim(s) allowed:  |  |
|   | Claim(s) objected to:  |  |
|   | Claim(s) rejected:   |  |
| <b>。</b> $\sqcap$                       | Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |
| 8. 🗆                                    | The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disap  | _  |
| 9. 🗆                                    | Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).  |  |
| 10. 🗆                                   | Other:   | MICHAEL THALER PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 3731  |

Application/Control Number: 09/707,445

Art Unit: 3731

The allegation on page 5, for example, that the Ryan et al. actuator system for bending cannula 24 must not be operable to bend the cannula with the probe therein simply because Ryan et al. teach bending the cannula 24 while the probe is not therein is not well founded. Nothing is seen which would prevent the flexible probe from bending while it is within the cannula. After all, the probe is bent while it is being inserted into the cannula in the Ryan et al. method.

As to the allegation on page 6, for example, that the tightly wound steel wires would allow aspirated tissue to pass between the steel wires is not well founded since the wires are tightly wound, as pointed out by applicant.